REMARKS

Claims 36-73 were pending in the application. Claims 36-63 are canceled herein. New claims 74-83 have been added hereinabove. Accordingly, claims 74-83 are pending.

Support for new claims 74-83 can be found in the specification as originally filed. Accordingly, these changes do not involve new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Support for new claim 74 can be found in the originally-filed specification at page 5, lines 15-28; page 6, lines 1-20; page 10, lines 3-8 and lines 27-29; and page 11, lines 1-3.

Support for new claim 75 can be found in the originally-filed specification at page 5, lines 15-23.

Support for new claim 76 can be found in the originally-filed specification at page 5, lines 15-23.

Support for new claim 77 can be found in the originally-filed specification at page 6, lines 8-20.

Support for new claim 78 can be found in the originally-filed specification at page 11, lines 3-5; and page 12, lines 6-7.

Support for new claim 79 can be found in the originally-filed specification at page 12, lines 17-29; and page 13, lines 1-11.

Support for new claim 80 can be found in the originally-filed specification at page 13, lines 13-16.

Support for new claim 81 can be found in the originally-filed specification at page 11, lines 18-23.

Support for new claim 82 can be found in the originally-filed specification at page 11, lines 25-27; page 12, lines 1-7.

Support for new claim 83 can be found in the originally-filed specification at page 12, lines 1-7.

In accordance with the changes to the claims and the remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections.

In paragraph 3, at page 2 of the November 17, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 64-73 are withdrawn from consideration.

In paragraph 4, at page 2 of the November 17, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 36-63 are being examined. Applicants note that claims 36-63 have been canceled herein.

THE OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

In paragraph 5, at page 2 of the November 17, 2004 Office Action, the Office objected to claim 49 because the notation "SEQ ID NO : 2" is not proper and requested its change to SEQ ID NO:2. In response, Applicants have complied with the Office's request.

In paragraph 6, at page 2 of the November 17, 2004 Office Action, the Office objected to claim 50 because the notation "SEQ ID NO : 3; SEQ ID NO : 4; and SEQ ID NO : 5" are

not proper and requested its change to SEQ ID NO:3, SEQ ID NO:4, and SEQ ID NO:5. In response, Applicants have complied with the Office's request.

In paragraph 7, at page 2 of the November 17, 2004 Office Action, the Office objected to claim 56 because the notation "SEQ ID NO : 6" is not proper and requested its change to SEQ ID NO:6. In response, Applicants have complied with the Office's request.

In paragraph 8, at page 2 of the November 17, 2004 Office Action, the Office objected to claim 57 because the notation "SEQ ID NO : 7" is not proper and requested its change to SEQ ID NO:7. In response, Applicants have complied with the Office's request.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

In paragraphs 9-10, at pages 2-3 of the November 17, 2004 Office Action, the Office rejected claims 36-63 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The Office has taken the position that the specification is enabling for (1) an anti-allergic pharmaceutical composition comprising (i) an acarid allergen comprising SEQ ID NO:2, an acarid allergen encoded by the by the polynucleotide comprising SEQ ID NO:1 or at least one peptide consisting of the amino acid sequence selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO:3-5, (ii) at least one antihistamine compound selected from the group consisting of brompheniramine, cetirizine, fexofenadine, cyproheptadine, dexchlorpheniramine, hydroxizine, ketotifene, loratadine, mequitazine, oxotomide, mizolastine, ebastine, astemizole, carbinoxamide, alimemazine, buclizine, cyclizine hydrochlorate and doxylamine, and optionally with an inhibitor of histamine synthesis tritoqualine and a pharmaceutically acceptabled carrier.

Applicants respectfully contend that the presently pending claimed methods are enabled. However, in order to further the prosecution of the subject application, Applicants have

canceled claims 36-63 and added new claims 74-83 which recites the language suggested by the Office and which the Office has taken the position is enabled.

In paragraph 11, at page 7 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 36-63 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the invention, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is a written description rejection of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Applicants respectfully contend that the claimed methods are adequately described in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112. However, in order to further the prosecution of the subject application, Applicants have canceled claims 36-63 and added new claims 74-83 which recites the language suggested by the Office. Accordingly, with the cancellation of claims 36-63, and addition of new claims 74-83, the rejection is obviated.

In paragraph 12, at page 9 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 36-63 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the invention, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is a new matter rejection of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in order to further the prosecution of the subject application, Applicants have canceled claims 36-63 and added new claim 74 (which relates to canceled claims 38, 39, and 36), new claims 75-76 (which relate to canceled claim 46), and new claim 77 (which relates to canceled claim 47). Accordingly, cancellation of claims 36-63 and addition of new claims 74-77 obviates the rejection.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

In paragraphs 13-14, at page 10 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 54 and 56-57 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in order to further the prosecution of the subject application, Applicants have canceled claims 54 and 56-57. Accordingly, cancellation of claims 54 and 56-57 obviates the rejection.

APPLICANTS' INVENTION

As amended, the present claims are directed to compositions comprising:

1. an acarid allergen comprising
    - i. the allergen encoded by the polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO:1,
    - ii. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:2,
    - iii. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:3,
    - vi. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:4, and/or
    - vii. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:6,
2. an antihistamine selected from the group consisting of
    - i. brompheniramine,
    - ii. cetirizine,
    - iii. fexofenadine,
    - iv. cyproheptadine,
    - v. dexchlorpheniramine,
    - vi. hydroxizine,
    - vii. ketotifene,
    - viii. loratidine,
    - ix. mequitazine,

x. oxotomide,
xi. mizolastine,
xii. ebastine,
xiii. astemizole,
xiv. carbinoxamide,
xv. alimemazine,
xvi. buclizine,
xvii. cyclizine hydrochlorate and
xviii. doxylamine, and

3. an inhibitor of histadine decarboxylase

(hereinafter referred to as elements 1-3 of the "Invention" section).

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In paragraphs 15-16, at page 10 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 36, 39, 42-43, and 59-63 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,256,680 (also referred to herein as the '680 patent).

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in order to further the prosecution of the subject application, Applicants have canceled claims 36, 39, 42-43, and 59-63 and added new claims 74, 82, and 83 (which relates to canceled claims 36, 39, 42, and 43).

The Legal Standard for Novelty

To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose every limitation of the claimed invention, either expressly or inherently. *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1574, 224 USPQ 409, 411 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Each and every element of the claimed invention must be disclosed in a single prior art reference in a manner sufficient to enable one skilled in the art to reduce the invention to practice, thus placing

the invention in possession of the public. *W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied* 469 U.S. 851, 105 S. Ct. 172 (1984); *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576-7 (Fed. Cir. 1991), *clarified, on recons.*, 1991 U.S.App. LEXIS 33,486 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The absence of even a single element from a prior art reference negates anticipation. *Atlas Powder Co. v. E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Applicants Have Met the Legal Standard for Novelty

Applicants have met the legal standard for novelty, because the single reference of the '680 patent, does not disclose every limitation of the claimed methods as follows.

The '680 patent describes novel experimental compounds which are 3,5-di-tertiary-butyl-4-hydroxyphenyl substituted 1,2,4- and 1,3,4-thiadazoles and oxadiazoles, and 1,2,4-triazoles, compound of formula (I) ('680 patent at column 1, lines 16-19). The compounds of the '680 patent are inhibitors of 5-lipooxygenase and/or cyclooxygenase and are disclosed as useful for treating inflammation, arthritis, pain, or pyrrhia.

The '680 patent does not describe an acarid allergen as required by the claims.

Further, the '680 patent does not describe an antihistamine selected from the group consisting of brompheniramine, fexofenadine, cyproheptadine, dexchlorpheniramine, hydroxizine, ketotifenc, mcquitazine, oxotomide, mizolastine, ebastine, astemizole, carbinoxamide, alimemazine, buclizine, cyclizine hydrochlorate and doxylamine.

Since the '680 patent does not teach any of these agents alone, let alone in combination as claimed, the '680 patent cannot anticipate the claimed anti-allergic pharmaceutical composition.

For these reasons, Applicants request the Office withdraw the art rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Paragraphs 17-19, Claims 36-44

In paragraphs 17-19, at page 11 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 36-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,256,680 in view of (1) US Patent No. 4,302,458 (also referred to herein as the '458 patent) and (2) US Patent No. 6,258,816 (also referred to herein as the '816 patent), US Patent No. 5,827,852 (also referred to herein as the '852 patent), or US Patent No. 6,319,513 (also referred to herein as the '513 patent).

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in order to further the prosecution of the subject application, Applicants have canceled claims 36, 39, 42-43, and 59-63 and added new claim 76 and 83 (which relates to canceled claims 36, 39, and 43).

The Legal Standard for Establishing Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The legal standard for a rejection under §103 is as follows. As set forth in MPEP §2143:

> To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art,

> to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination, and the reasonable expectation of success, must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure (*In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)).

Obviousness is a question of law based on findings of underlying facts relating to the prior art, the skill of the artisan, and objective considerations. See *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (1966). To establish a prima facie case of obviousness based on a combination of the content of various references, there must be some teaching, suggestion or motivation in the prior art to make the specific combination that was made by the applicant. *In re Raynes*, 7 F.3d 1037, 1039, 28 USPQ2d 1630, 1631 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Obviousness can not be established by hindsight combination to produce the claimed invention. *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 986, 18 USPQ2d 1885, 1888 (Fed. Cir. 1991). As discussed in *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 USPQ 543, 551 (Fed. Cir. 1985), it is the prior art itself, and not the applicant's achievement, that must establish the obviousness of the combination.

The teachings of the references, their relatedness to the field of the applicant's endeavor, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the field of the invention, are all relevant considerations. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d at 1447, 24 USPQ2d at 1445-46; *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d at 986-87, 18 USPQ2d at 1888; *In re Young*, 927 F.2d 588, 591, 18 USPQ2d 1089, 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1991). When the references are in the same field as that of the applicant's invention, knowledge thereof is presumed. However, the test of whether it would have been obvious to select specific teachings and combine them, as did the applicant, must still be met by identification of some suggestion, teaching, or motivation

in the prior art, arising from what the prior art would have taught a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075, 5 USPQ2d 1596,1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicants Have Met the Legal Standard for Nonobviousness

The cited references when combined do not teach or suggest the invention as a whole. Specifically, none of the cited prior art references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest:

1. an acarid allergen comprising
    - i. the allergen encoded by the polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO:1,
    - ii. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:2,
    - iii. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:3,
    - viii. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:4, and/or
    - ix. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:6, or
2. an antihistamine selected from the group consisting of
    - i. ketotifene,
    - ii. oxotomide,
    - xi. mizolastine,
    - xiv. carbinoxamide,
    - xviii. doxylamine.

The '680 patent has been described above.

The '458 patent describes novel derivatives of phthalidyl-isoquinolines -- an inhibitor of histadine decarboxylase -- their preparation, and their use as medicaments, in particular for treating allergy conditions. Specifically, the '458 patent, describes the synthesis of a novel compound called 458 L compound and provides in vitro or in vivo data of histidine

decarboxylase inhibition, but does not show any therapeutic effect alone, let alone in combination with other therapeutic agents.

The '458 patent does not teach the elements of:

1. an acarid allergen comprising
   i. the allergen encoded by the polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO:1,
   ii. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:2,
   iii. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:3,
   iv. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:4, and/or
   v. the allergen as shown in SEQ ID NO:6,
2. an antihistamine selected from the group consisting of brompheniramine, cetirizine, fexofenadine, cyproheptadine, dexchlorpheniramine, hydroxizine, ketotifene, loratidine, mequitazine, oxotomide, mizolastine, ebastine, astemizole, carbinoxamide, alimemazine, buclizine, cyclizine hydrochlorate and doxylamine

(hereinafter referred to 1-2 as set forth in the "Applicants' Invention" section above).

The '816 patent teaches a novel composition of nimesulide and salts thereof and cetirizine possessing antileukotriene, antihistaminic, antiallergic and anti-inflammatory action. Nimesulide is a potent stabilizer of mast cells and basophils and is a potent anti-oxidant ('816 patent at col. 4, lines 16-42).

The '816 patent does not teach the acarid allergen as required by the claims. Further the '816 patent does not teach or suggest an inhibitor of histadine decarboxylases.

The '852 patent teaches a pharmaceutical composition suitable for a coating system for the delivery of drugs comprising a composition coated with from about 0.01% to about 10% by weight of the composition with a volatile aromatic compound selected from the

group consisting of 3-1-menthoxy propane-1,2-diol, N-substituted-p-menthane-3-carboxamides and acyclic carboxamides and mixtures thereof.

Like the '816 patent, the '852 patent does not teach the acarid allergen as required by the claims. Further the '816 patent does not teach or suggest an inhibitor of histidine decarboxylases.

The patent '513 relates to a pharmaceutical mucoretentive, aqueous liquid composition comprising from about 2% to about 50%, by weight of the composition, of colloidal particles of silica, titanium dioxide, clay, and mixtures thereof and a safe and effective amount of a pharmaceutical active selected from the group consisting of analgesics, decongestants, expectorants, antitussives, antihistamines, sensory agents, gastrointestinal agents, and mixtures thereof; wherein the composition has a sedimentation volume ratio of greater than about 0.90 and wherein the triggered viscosity ratio of the composition is at least about 1.2.

With respect to patent '513, it is submitted that this patent discloses only a drug delivery system and relates to oral liquid pharmaceutical mucoadhesive compositions.

The '513 patent does not teach the acarid allergen as required by the claims. Further the '816 patent does not teach or suggest an inhibitor of histidine decarboxylases.

Since the '680 patent teaches inhibitors of histidine decarboxylases but not the elements of 1 set forth in the "Invention" section above, to meet the requirements for prima facie obviousness, the remaining cited references must remedy the deficiencies of the '680 patent. At least one of the secondary references, the '458 and any of the '816, '852, or 513 patents, must disclose element 1 set forth in the "Invention" section above. However, none of the remaining references cures the deficiencies of the '680 patent because none of the remaining references, i.e., the '458, '816, '852, or '513 patents

disclose the missing element 1 as described above. Accordingly, these references alone, or taken together, cannot suggest the claimed compositions, and do not remedy the deficiencies of the '680 patent.

Lacking such a teaching, there is no motivation provided for combining the '680 patent and the '458 patent with any of the '816, '852, or '513 patent to suggest the present claimed compositions.

Based on the legal standard for 35 U.S.C. §103(a), a combination of reference teachings is improper unless the prior art suggests such a combination. As stated previously, there must be a reason or suggestion in the art for modifying the prior art other than the knowledge learned from Applicants' disclosure (*In re Dow Chemical Co.*, 837 F.2d 469, 473, 5 USPQ2d 1529, 1532 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

The cited references provide no such reason or suggestion. Moreover, the combined teachings of the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. The cited references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Accordingly, the rejection is obviated.

HINDSIGHT RECONSTRUCTION OF THE INVENTION

Hindsight reconstruction is contrary to the legal standard for obviousness, and cannot be used to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention. (*In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075, (Fed. Cir. 1988)). The determination of obviousness has to be assessed on the basis of the skilled person's knowledge before the priority or filing date of the application (*Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 USPQ 543, 551 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

There is no way to achieve the claimed compositions, using the cited references simply because the cited references do not teach (1) the particular acarid allergen recited by the claims, and/or (2) some of the particular antihistamine compounds required by the claims. Accordingly, even if one were to use improper hindsight (using Applicants' invention) to "pick and choose" the reagents from the cited references, one cannot do so since none of the cited references suggests (1) the particular acarid allergen recited by the claims, and/or (2) some of the particular antihistamine compounds required by the claims, let alone a combination thereof.

Applicants maintain that they have met the legal standards for nonobviousness, because none of the cited references describe or suggest the claimed compositions of the subject invention. The cited references do not provide every element of the claimed invention and do not provide motivation for combining the disclosures of these references and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Paragraph 20, Claims 36, 39, 45-53, 55, and 58-63

In paragraph 20, at page 14 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 36, 39, 45-53, 55, and 58-63 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,256,680 in view of (1) US Patent No. 6,455,686 and (2) US Patent No. 5,433,948 or US Patent No. 5,820,862.

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in order to further the prosecution of the subject application, Applicants have canceled claims 36, 39, 45-53, 55 and 58-63 and added new claims 74 , 75, 76, 77, and 81 (which relate to canceled claims 36, 39, 46-47, 49-50, and 52-53).

As amended, the cited references, when combined, do not teach every aspect of the claimed compositions. Therefore, the rejection must fail as to these new claims.

The '680 patent was previously discussed.

The '686 patent discloses a combination of an anti-histamine compound with a dust mite allergen but not the anti-histamine compound or the allergen recited in the claims. Nor does the '686 patent disclose inhibitors of histidine decarboxylase.

The '948 patent discloses the cloning and sequencing of allergens of dermatophagoides and T cell epitopes of the major allergens from dermatophagoides for the treatment of allergy to house dust mite but do not teach elements 2-3 as set forth in the "Invention" section above.

Neither the '686 nor the '948 patent disclose (1) the particular acarid allergen recited by the claims, (2) the particular antihistamine compounds required by the claims and (3) the inhibitors of histidine decarboxylase of the invention. Neither the '686 nor the '948 patent teaches or suggests the particular acarid allergen and particular antihistamine compounds in combination the use of an inhibitor of histidine decarboxylase.

THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT RENDER OBVIOUS THE CLAIMED METHODS

According to MPEP §2143, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met.

First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.

Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success.

Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

None of the Cited References Disclose or Suggest the Combination (1) the particular acarid allergen recited by the claims, (2) the particular antihistamine compounds required by the claims and (3) an inhibitor of histidine decarboxylase

Neither primary reference, i.e., the '680 patent, nor the secondary references, namely, the '686 patent and any of the '948 or '862 patent, teaches or suggests the particular acarid allergen recited by the claims. Element 1 of the "Invention" section above is an essential component of the claimed compositions.

As described above, the '680 patent teaches novel experimental compounds which are 3,5-di-tertiary-butyl-4-hydroxyphenyl substituted 1,2,4- and 1,3,4-thiadazoles and oxadiazoles, and 1,2,4-triazoles, compound of formula (I). However, the '680 does not teach any of the elements of 1 of the "Invention" section above.

Therefore, for prima facie obviousness, the remaining cited references must remedy the deficiencies of the '680 patent. At least one of the secondary references, the '686 and either the '948 or '862 patent, must disclose the missing element 1 of the "Invention" section, and suggest its combined use.

However, neither the '686 patent and either the '948 and '862 patent disclose the missing elements as described above. Accordingly, these references alone, or taken together, cannot suggest the claimed compositions, and do not remedy the deficiencies of the '680 patent.

Motivation to combine (1) the particular acarid allergen recited by the claims, (2) the particular antihistamine compounds required by the claims and (3) an inhibitor of

histidine decarboxylase, to arrive at the presently claimed compositions, must come from the cited references.

Lacking such a teaching, there is no motivation provided for combining the '680 patent with the '686 and either the '948 or '862 patents to suggest the present claimed compositions.

HINDSIGHT RECONSTRUCTION OF THE INVENTION

As discussed above, one cannot even use improper hindsight to "pick and choose" the reagents from the cited references to arrive at Applicants' invention since none of references teach (1) the particular acarid allergen recited by the claims, or (2) some of the particular antihistamine compounds required by the claims. Given that these elements are missing from the cited references, one cannot pick and choose from what is not disclosed to combine with an inhibitor of histidine decarboxylase in order to arrive at Applicants' invention.

Accordingly, Applicants maintain that they have met the legal standards for nonobviousness, because none of the cited references describe or suggest the claimed compositions methods of the subject invention. The cited references do not provide motivation for combining the disclosures of these references.

Paragraph 21, Claims 54 and 56-57

In paragraph 21, at page 18 of the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 54 and 56-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,256,680 in view of US Patent No. 6,455,686 or US Patent No. 5,433,948 or US Patent No. 5,820,862 in view of Hsu, Ginkel, and Hoyne

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in order to further the prosecution of the subject application, Applicants have canceled claims 54 and 56-57. The rejection is now moot.

CONCLUSION

If a telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the present application, Applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone her at the number provided below.

No fee, except the one-month extension of time fee, is deemed necessary in connection with the filing of this Amendment. If any further fee is necessary, the Patent Office is authorized to charge the additional fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0306.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah B. Adriano
Registration No. 34,470
Teresa Y. Liang
Registration No. 51,946
Patent Practitioners for Applicants
Mandel & Adriano
55 So. Lake Ave., Suite 710
Pasadena, California 91101
626/395-7801
Customer No: 26,941